



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,595	12/22/2000	Daniel P. Starkovich	RA 5344 (33012/305/101)	8241

27516 7590 04/27/2005

UNISYS CORPORATION
MS 4773
PO BOX 64942
ST. PAUL, MN 55164-0942

EXAMINER

EL CHANTI, HUSSEIN A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/747,595

Applicant(s)

STARKOVICH ET AL.

Examiner

Hussein A. El-chanti

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to amendment received on July 2, 2004. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 16 were amended. Claims 1-25 are pending examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 6, 11-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dutta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,615,212 (referred to hereafter as Dutta).

As to claim 1, Dutta teaches a user terminal for entering a transaction request as a message, wherein said transaction request has one of a plurality of formats, responsively coupled via a publicly available digital communication network to an enterprise server for responding to said transaction request, the improvement comprising:

- a. an adapter responsively coupled to said user terminal which converts said transaction request to an intermediate format (see col. 5 lines 45-col. 6 lines 23 and col. 7 lines 45-col. 8 lines 32, client sends request where the request is transcoded to an intermediate format); and

b. A middleware generic gateway interposed between said user terminal and said enterprise server which converts said XML message to a different format and responsively couples said user terminal to said enterprise server (see col. 5 lines 45-col. 6 lines 23 and col. 3 lines 54-64, the request converted to a format compatible with the content server by a proxy server).

As to claim 6 and 16, Dutta teaches an apparatus comprising:

- a. A user terminal and means which generates a service request as an message using one of a plurality of formats;
- b. A publicly accessible digital data communication network responsively coupled to said user terminal;
- c. A generic gateway within a server responsibly coupled to said publicly available digital data communication network; and
- d. An enterprise server responsively coupled to said generic server (see col. 5 lines 45-col. 6 lines 23 and col. 3 lines 54-64).

As to claim 11, Dutta teaches a method of processing a transaction comprising:

- a. Composing a service request as a message using one of a plurality of formats;
- b. Transferring said message via a publicly accessible digital data communication network to one of a plurality of adapters corresponding to said one of said plurality of formats within a server; and
- c. Converting said message into a standardized format for processing within a generic gateway within said server (see col. 5 lines 45-col. 6 lines 23 and col. 3 lines 54-64).

As to claim 12, Dutta teaches a method according to claim 11 further comprising:

a. Transferring said converted and processed service request from said generic gateway to an end service provider (see col. 5 lines 5-20).

As to claim 13, Dutta a method according to claim 12 wherein said publicly accessible digital data communication network further comprises the internet (see col. 2 lines 1-12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in view of Guck, U.S. Patent No. 5,848,415.

As to claim 2, Dutta teaches a user terminal for entering a transaction request as a message, wherein said transaction request has one of a plurality of formats, responsively coupled via a publicly available digital communication network to an enterprise server for responding to said transaction request comprising:

a. A generic gateway interposed between said user terminal and said enterprise server which converts said XML message to a different format and responsively couples said user terminal to said enterprise server (see col. 5 lines 45-col. 6 lines 23 and col. 3 lines 54-64).

Dutta does not explicitly teach a plurality of adapters interposed between said generic gateway and said user terminal which responsively couples said user terminal to said generic gateway wherein each one of said plurality of adapters corresponds to said one of said plurality of formats.

However Guck teaches a system comprising a plurality of adapters where each adapter correspond to a format (see abstract and col. 5 lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dutta by incorporating a plurality of adapters as taught by Guck because doing so would accommodate different content formatting requirements (e.g., plain text, HTML, postscript) as well as different protocol requirements (e.g., mail, news, FTP, etc.)

As to claims 3 and 8, Dutta teaches the improvement according to claim 2 wherein said publicly available digital communication network further comprises the internet (see col. 2 lines 1-12).

As to claims 5 and 10, Dutta teaches the improvement according to claim 4 wherein said user terminal further comprises an industry compatible personal computer (see col. 3 lines 40-65).

As to claim 7, Dutta does not explicitly teach a plurality of adapters interposed between said generic gateway and said user terminal which responsively couples said user terminal to said generic gateway wherein each one of said plurality of adapters corresponds to said one of said plurality of formats.

However Guck teaches a system comprising a plurality of adapters where each adapter correspond to a format (see abstract and col. 5 lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dutta by incorporating a plurality of adapters as taught by Guck because doing so would accommodate different content formatting requirements (e.g., plain text, HTML, postscript) as well as different protocol requirements (e.g., mail, news, FTP, etc.)

As to claim 17, Dutta does not explicitly teach a plurality of adapters interposed between said generic gateway and said user terminal which responsively couples said user terminal to said generic gateway wherein each one of said plurality of adapters corresponds to said one of said plurality of formats.

However Guck teaches a system comprising a plurality of adapters where each adapter correspond to a format (see abstract and col. 5 lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dutta by incorporating a plurality of adapters as taught by Guck because doing so would accommodate different content formatting requirements (e.g., plain text, HTML, postscript) as well as different protocol requirements (e.g., mail, news, FTP, etc.)

As to claim 18, Guck teaches said one of said plurality of adapters corresponds to said one of said plurality of said plurality of connectors (see col. 5 lines 1-8 and abstract).

As to claim 19, Dutta apparatus of claim 18 wherein said publicly accessible digital data communication network is the internet (see col. 2 lines 1-20).

As to claim 20, Dutta does not explicitly teach an industry compatible personal computer operating under windows.

Official notice as evident by "Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th Edition" is taken that one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to use windows because doing so would allow a user to use a graphical interface to send and receive messages or requests and therefore have a more friendly user environment.

As to claim 21, an apparatus for providing communication between a user and server having a database comprising:

- a. an XML message service request generated in one of a plurality of request formats by user;
 - b. a plurality of adapters capable of converting request formats to standardized format;
 - c. XML service request coupled to said plurality of adapters;
 - d. a generic gateway coupled to said adapters;
- (see col. 5 lines 45-col. 6 lines 23 and col. 3 lines 54-64).

Dutta does not explicitly teach a plurality of adapters interposed between said generic gateway and said user terminal which responsively couples said user terminal to said generic gateway wherein each one of said plurality of adapters corresponds to said one of said plurality of formats.

However Guck teaches a system comprising a plurality of adapters where each adapter correspond to a format and an OSMOS database with a database manager (see abstract, col. 2 lines 58-col. 3 lines 20 and col. 5 lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dutta by incorporating a plurality of adapters as taught by Guck because doing so would accommodate different content formatting requirements (e.g., plain text, HTML, postscript) as well as different protocol requirements (e.g., mail, news, FTP, etc.)

Guck and Dutta do not explicitly teach the limitation "OLTP database". Official notice as evident by "Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th Edition" is taken that one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to use an OLTP database because doing so would allow the processing system to process client requests as soon as the requests are received.

As to claim 22, Guck teaches the apparatus of claim 21 comprising view definition which describes a format (see col. 2 lines 58-col. 3 lines 20).

As to claim 23, Guck teaches the apparatus of claim 22 wherein said gateway converts said xml message into a data buffer in accordance with view definition (see col. 2 lines 58-col. 3 lines 20).

As to claim 24, Guck teaches the apparatus of claim 24 further comprising an output view definition coupled to gateway (see col. 2 lines 58-col. 3 lines 20).

As to claim 25, Guck teaches the apparatus of claim 24 comprising an output buffer created by said gateway in accordance with said output view definition (see col. 2 lines 58-col. 3 lines 20).

4. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in view of Guck, further in view of Deisinger et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,397,220 (referred to hereafter as Deisinger).

Dutta teaches the improvement according to claim 1 further comprising a plurality of adapters interposed between said generic gateway and said user terminal which responsively couples said user terminal to said generic gateway wherein each one of said plurality of adapters corresponds to said one of said plurality of formats (see the rejection of claim 2).

Dutta does not explicitly teach the limitation the improvement further comprising an NT Server housing said generic gateway and providing a WebTX environment.

However Deisinger teaches a method of receiving and routing requests through the internet using an NT server in a WebTx environment (see col. 5 lines 43-65).

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dutta by implementing an NT server in a WebTx environment as taught by Deisinger because doing so would transform a request such as a URL from a Web browser into a format which is understandable by a distributed transaction processing system and also transform data returned from the distributed transaction processing system into a formatted response which is returned to the requester and therefore overcoming compatibility issues with a client and a server.

Art Unit: 2157

5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in view of Mears et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,438,580 (referred to hereafter as Mears).

Dutta teaches a method of processing a transaction comprising composing a service request as a message using one of a plurality of formats (see the rejection of claim 11).

Dutta does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "said plurality of formats further comprises an active server page". However Mears teaches a method of building interactive knowledgeable database using active server page (see col. 5 lines 45-59).

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dutta by using active page server format as taught by Mears because doing so would allow the user view a message using an HTML page using a web browser and therefore overcome the need of an e-mail software.

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in view of Krishan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,442,559 (referred to hereafter as Krishan).

Dutta teaches a method of processing a transaction comprising composing a service request as a message using one of a plurality of formats (see the rejection of claim 11).

Dutta does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "said plurality of formats further comprises visual basic". However Krishan teaches a method for delivering messages where the message is written in visual basic (see col. 20 lines 1-13).

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dutta by using visual basic format as taught by Krishan because

doing so would allow the user to view messages in a variety of formats and therefore overcoming compatibility problems by delivering messages in formats that can be accessed by the intended receiver.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 and 16-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-15 and 21-25 filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant argues in substance that; A) Dutta does not disclose an adapter and a middleware generic gateway for a two step format conversion.

In response to A) Dutta teaches a system and method for receiving a client request and converting the request to a format compatible with the content server through a proxy server (see col. 5 lines 45-65). In return, the proxy server receives content from the content server and converts the content to a format compatible with the client (see col. 7 lines 45-col. 8 lines 32). Also, Dutta teaches the request and the response can be converted to an intermediate format by the proxy server; the intermediate format is then converted to a format compatible with the server or the client (see col. 5 lines 45-col. 6 lines 23 and col. 7 lines 45-col. 8 lines 32). Dutta also explicitly teaches the intermediate format conversion may be done by multiple middleware proxy servers (see col. 8 lines 23-32). There is no limitation in the claim on where the adapter is located i.e. client machine, content server or middleware gateway and therefore the

Art Unit: 2157

format conversion done one or plurality of middleware proxy servers taught by Dutta meets the scope of the claimed limitation "an adapter and a middleware generic gateway".

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hussein A. El-chanti whose telephone number is (571)272-3999. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hussein El-chanti

April 25, 2005


ARIELLE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100